DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 464 722 PS 030 333

AUTHOR Beck, Robert J.
TITLE Moral Scripts and Dialogic Inquiry in Scaffolding Young Children's Cultural Understanding of a Movie Story.
PUB DATE 2002-04-01
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 1-5, 2002).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Content Analysis; Models; *Moral Development; *Moral Values; *Mothers; Parent Child Relationship; *Preschool Children; Scaffolding (Teaching Technique)
IDENTIFIERS Dialogue Analysis

ABSTRACT

In a movie retelling task that was concerned with the moral dilemma of how to treat a hurt wild animal, the extended preparatory dialogues of seven effective middle-class mothers and their 5-year-olds were studied to develop a moral script and dialogic inquiry model of scaffolding children's narrative competency. A content analysis of the dialogues revealed that all the dyads used comparable moral scripts consisting of references to the story characters' actions and subjective states to repair and support children's understanding of the moral rule. A turn-taking analysis of the dialogues showed that mothers and children generally engaged in: (1) an initial inquiry phase consisting of initiatory questions, responses, and evaluation turns sequences (IRE) that were used to establish what children thought were characters' actions, intentions, and feelings; and (2) a follow-up, moral explanation and argument phase in which participants urged different courses of action to resolve the dilemma. A scaffolding model for fostering narrative competency was proposed for developing children's intersubjective understanding and moral reasoning. Mothers used syllogistic and simple causal reasoning to argue their theories of the characters' intentions, actions, and needs in the story; while children made counterarguments using emotional, egocentric, and immature moral reasoning. Based on this model, a program was designed for training parents to support their children's production of moral meanings from stories. (Contains 41 references.) (Author/HTH)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 464 722

Moral Scripts and Dialogic Inquiry in Scaffolding Young Children's Cultural Understanding of a Movie Story

Robert J. Beck

University of California, Irvine

Paper presented to a Symposium on Fostering Narrative Competency
at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association,
New Orleans, April 1, 2002

Department of Education
2001 Berkeley Place
Irvine, CA 92697-5500
rbeck@uci.edu

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Robert J Beck
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

PS 030333

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Moral scripts and dialogic inquiry in scaffolding

Abstract

In a movie retelling task that was concerned with the moral dilemma of how to treat a hurt wild animal, the extended preparatory dialogues of seven effective middle-class mothers and their 5-year-olds were studied to develop a moral script and dialogic inquiry model of scaffolding children's narrative competency. A content analysis of the dialogues revealed that all the dyads used comparable moral scripts consisting of references to the story characters' actions and subjective states to repair and support children's understanding of the moral rule. A turn taking analysis of the dialogues showed that mothers and children generally engaged in (a) an initial inquiry phase consisting of initiatory questions, responses, and evaluation turns sequences (IRE) that were used to establish what children thought were characters' actions, intentions and feelings; and (b) a follow-up, moral explanation and argument phase in which participants urged different courses of action to resolve the dilemma. A scaffolding model for fostering narrative competency was proposed for developing children's intersubjective understanding and moral reasoning. Mothers used syllogistic and simple causal reasoning to argue their theories of the characters' intentions, actions and needs in the story; while children made counterarguments using emotional, egocentric and immature moral reasoning. Based on this model, a program was designed for training parents to support their children's production of moral meanings from stories.

INTRODUCTION

This research was concerned with developing a moral script and dialogic inquiry model of natural conversational strategies used by seven pairs of mothers and their 5 year-olds in extended dialogues to prepare and scaffold their children's subsequent independent recall and comprehension in retelling a brief movie story. The story posed a complex moral dilemma about whether to put a hurt reindeer out of its misery. In previous research on effective preparation for young children retelling this movie, it had been found that an experimental teacher strategy involving systematic questioning of children concerning the major features of the story, and corrections of the children's responses, if needed, were superior to natural maternal strategies. Moreover, mothers who spontaneously emulated the experimental strategy by using frequent questions and corrections, were associated with children who performed significantly better than a group whose mothers did not employ the strategy (Beck & Clarke-Stewart, 1998). It had also been determined that children who had participated in at least one extended dialogue with their mothers, defined as 5-17 turns in which topical focus was maintained, received significantly higher scores for recall of facts and comprehension of actions and intentions in their retold stories (Clarke-Stewart & Beck, 1999). These extended dialogues were all preoccupied with the moral issues of the story. In the seven dialogues of this study the moral issue concerned the treatment of the reindeer. The sample dialogues were treated, in effect, as expert systems and analyzed as exemplary models of discussions to support children's moral cultural understanding. How and why were these extended dialogues effective instructionally in a cultural appropriation context?

Valsiner's (1996) methodological model of culture and cognition was used to understand communicative interactions between the participants in a cultural appropriation context. Drawing on models of cultural appropriation (Rogoff, 1993), co-construction of moral cognition (Kurtines, Alvarez & Azmitia, 1990) and the dialogical nature of mental processes (Markova & Foppa, 1991), Valsiner proposed a series of pathways to methodological approaches to the study of how culture and cognition are interdependent. He stated that: (1) emergent processes should be selected as objects of

inquiry in the context of natural problem solving; (2) these processes could be analyzed through microgenetic research of dialogic events; (3) the search would be for functioning structures that lead not to conformity with the demands of the normative cultural context, but to the emergence of "novel mechanisms in ways *coordinated with* context demands" (author's emphasis, p. 47). It was considered that scaffolding, an adult- or expert-facilitated process that enabled a child or novice to solve a problem, carry out a task, or achieve a goal that would be beyond his or her unassisted efforts (Wood, Bruner and Ross, 1976), could provide an analytic framework for studying how extended dialogues incorporated these pathways. The purpose of the study was to develop a model of scaffolding that explained how moral cultural understandings were interdependently constructed by mothers and children during extended dialogues.

Scaffolding theory and research

Wood and Middleton (1975) found that mothers who scaffolded successfully were those who had systematically changed their instructions on the basis of the child's response to earlier interventions and were able to estimate the child's current ability or readiness for different types of instructions. Such mothers were therefore contingently responsive to their children and employed verbal communications within their intellectual grasp. Hobsbaum, Peters and Sylva (1996) argued that "scaffolding can take place only in one-on-one teaching situations because contingent responding requires a detailed understanding of the learner's history, the immediate task and the teaching strategies needed to move on" (p. 32).

While researchers such as Wood and Bruner did not refer to the length of exchanges of turns between mother and child, it is apparent that in order to "systematically change instructions on the basis of the child's response to earlier interventions" dialogues would need to consist of an *extended* series of turns on particular topics. Moreover, there is a growing body of evidence that topically focused elaborative and extended exchanges between adults and children contributed to children's narrative and language development. Several investigators found that children included more material in narratives of personal experience when parents *extended children's topics* rather than switching topics (McCabe & Peterson, 1991) or when mothers asked them *elaborative* questions (Fivush & Fromhoff, 1988; Reese & Fivush, 1993; Reese, Haden &

Fivush, 1993). In a study of shared book reading, Haden, Reese & Fivush (1993) found that children, whose mothers *embellished and elaborated* on indirectly specified information in the storybook, understood and retold the story better (although these differences were not statistically significant because of the small sample studied). As part of maternal training programs, Arnold et al. (1994), Dale et al. (1996), Lonigan & Whitehurst (1998), and Whitehurst et al. (1988) found that when mothers employed *numerous questions, followed children's answers with questions, shadowed their interests*, and *expanded* what they said, this promoted their language development. Scaffolded extension and elaboration of children's story topics appears to be critical in the development of children's understanding of narratives.

A relatively ignored characteristic of conversational scaffolding about narrative subjects has been that it not only consists of speech acts like questions and corrections that are used to probe and assess understanding, but that these verbalizations are concerned with a particular topic or theme (although see Mehan, 1979; and McCabe & Peterson, 1991). Lemke (1993) argued that an adequate account of an episode must address the thematic content as well as the activity structures. In the movie story segment under investigation, the theme addressed is the moral problem of whether to put a hurt deer out of its misery. Attached to this question thematically are issues in the story like the feelings of a young girl for the deer, whether hurt wild animals can be helped, as well as rationales for her father to shoot the deer. It might be expected that an extended set of conversational turns might be required to fully elaborate the theme. Therefore, it would be interesting to analyze how mothers and children used sequences of topically focused scaffolds during their dialogues to help children understand stories.

Morality scripts

Narrative structures dictate the kinds of thematic content needed to make sense of the story. These structures, such as character intentions and feelings and moral rules, might complement the dialogic moves in developing a comprehensive model of scaffolding. As Bruner (1986) theorized, story comprehension consists of integrating the dual landscape of story actions and characters' consciousness or intentions. Beck and Clarke-Stewart (1998) found that the critical cognitive development issue for young children in retelling stories was not so much the recall of the so-called causal chain of

objective actions, but rather the comprehension of characters' intentions. Furthermore, the understanding of intentions is a key developmental milestone in children's moral socialization (Blasi, 1987) and therefore the children in this study might not understand the intentions of characters in the movie story. Newman, Griffin and Cole (1989) directed attention to the asymmetry between adults and children in culturally organized activities in which the dominant task definition is one of movement toward the adult system. Because of the complexities of the moral issue in the movie, it was expected that the mothers and children of this study might have asymmetric views of the moral issue based on the latter's developmentally challenged understanding. Several studies of young children's moral socialization using mother-child dialogues as data have analyzed the role of implicit *morality scripts* in which adults respond to children's misbehaviors with scaffolding that supports their understanding of relevant norms and rules (Emde, Johnson & Easterbrooks, 1987; Edwards, 1987; Much & Shweder, 1978). In Beck and Wood's (1993) study of a fight between two pre-adolescent brothers brought to a family discussion, the parental moral scripts referred to the boys' communications concerning their intentions toward each other, the history (stories) of their aggressive interactions, and to moral standards of verbal and physical aggression. The scripts were used by the parents both to inquire into, and to repair, the children's misunderstandings or lack of understanding of their actions. It was theorized, therefore, that in the present study mothers would use script-based arguments to overcome the asymmetric moral understanding engendered by the complex moral problem of this movie story. How would mothers, and children, integrate script-based arguments into their extended dialogues? What forms of exchanges during turn taking, such as questions, corrections and explanations would form such inquiry and argument?

Scaffolding as dialogic inquiry

Stone (1998) criticized research that employed unidimensional coding systems such as counting types of parental questions and their responses to children's understandings. He suggested that such an approach was likely to miss important "communications dynamics" in optimal patterns of scaffolding. The study of communicational processes, rather than frequency of individual scaffolds, would be more likely to yield understanding of rules governing well-formed scaffolding. Explicit in the

research of scaffolding as *extending* and *expanding* children's responses is the idea that the *exchanges* of communications or dialogic moves need to be analyzed to provide a more detailed model of knowledge construction in instructional dialogues. Halliday (1993) also stated that exchanges of dialogue were the meaningful units to analyze not individual moves. Only exchanges could adequately show how collaborative knowledge artifacts were co-constructed by participants in a dialogue.

Wells (1999) summarized a dialogical inquiry model of semiotically mediated activity: it involves co-participants, who have varying degrees of skill, and are engaged in jointly solving a problem; there are cultural artifacts, e.g., norms and reasoning, that may be used to mediate the solution; an "object", such as the story of the video and its moral in the present case, is created in the process of formulating a solution. Bereiter (1994, p. 7) added that the knowledge building needs to be progressive in order to reach common understanding. The process should frame and test and expand the body of propositions, allowing criticism if it advances the discourse. From an analysis of a large corpus of classroom dialogues, Wells (1999) concluded that inquiry-response-evaluation moves in instructional conversations offered evidence of a ubiquitous conversational structure, with variations, that contributed to progressive knowledge building.

Structures of dialogic inquiry: IRE sequences

It is argued that a dialogic inquiry model of scaffolding is supported by the typical IRE sequences found in formal classroom dialogues, in which a teacher **I**nitiates with a question, the child **R**esponds, and the adult **E**valuates the response. IRE sequences were first recognized and labeled as such by Sinclair and Courthauld (1975) and found in naturalistic observational studies of verbal behavior in high school classrooms (Bellack & Davitz, 1963; Amidon & Flanders, 1963; Flanders, 1963; Cazden, 1988). The researchers found that in these dialogues the IRE were used to start teacher-student exchanges; these IRE then formed the basis for later collaborative elaborations in the conversation. Mehan (1979) specified a particular variety of extended educational exchanges that followed a theme, which he termed "Topically Related Sets," consisting of multiple basic IREs and conditional IREs, e.g., IRs. Several studies have found that IREs are effective strategies in contributing to children's learning (Flanders, 1963; Beck & Clarke-Stewart, 1998). Lemke (1990) identified a ubiquitous generic structure in learning in which English is the

language of instruction as the *triadic dialogue*, which consists of multiple repeating sequences of IREs.

Attention has been drawn to the role of the third term, E, in IRE exchanges (Wells, 1999). Sinclair and Courthauld refer to this term as *follow-up* to a response, while Mehan has emphasized that the move is an *evaluation*, which may be the most common use. Wells (1999) theorized that the third term served to provide feedback that extended the student's answer to draw out its significance, or to make connections with other parts of the student's total experience of the unit (p. 200). "...in the third move of the IRF exchange - - when this discourse genre is used effectively - - it is in this third step in the co-construction of meaning that the next cycle of the learning-and-teaching has its point of departure" (Wells, p. 207). Beck and Wood (1993) also found that questions embedded in third turns in moral socialization dialogues served as feedback to extend discussions.

Wood, Bruner and Ross (1976), Dillon (1988), and Herrenkohl and Guerra (1998) have argued, however, that teachers' use of IRE in classrooms were simply ritual recitation techniques and were not productive for students' learning. It was suggested that in using IREs teachers merely asked questions to which they knew the answers, i.e., to simply test and not build upon and extend student prior knowledge. In naturalistic cultural appropriation discourse, however, it is probably rare that parents are simply testing children when they use IRE communications. Beck and Wood (1993) found that while parental evaluations during moral socialization dialogues were used to correct children, their evaluations also addressed selected parts of communications that children needed to pay attention to because they apparently misunderstood the issues. Thus, evaluations served to elaborate, not bring closure to the inquiry.

Graesser, Bowers, Hacker & Person (1997) carried out a naturalistic study of tutoring involving 13 tutors and 40 tutees in middle school and high school research methods and mathematics courses. Detailed microanalyses were performed on the tutorial dialogues, including the speech acts within each turn and the feedback that speakers gave each other's contributions, in order to identify particular strategies and conversational styles of individuals. It was found that tutors who engaged in collaborative question answering and problem solving were highly effective: the dialogic explanations improved tutees' comprehension and memory for material. Collaborative strategies involved joint

tutor-tutee *elaborations* of IRE sequences. Thus, in 4th and 5th steps beyond standard three-step IREs, tutors and tutees collaboratively improved upon the initial levels of understanding.

Research questions

How well did a sample of extended dialogues of successful mother-child pairs fit the moral script and dialogic inquiry scaffolding models? Specifically:

Did the dialogues employ morality scripts consisting of references to a set of standard subtopics in the form of story characters' actions, intentions, emotions and moral rules that contributed to children's understanding of the moral theme? (Q1)

Did the dialogic inquiry consist of IRE turn taking sequences (Q2a) and collaborative explanations and moral arguments (Q2b), that revealed participants' theories of moral responsibility and action?

METHOD

Sample

The seven mothers and children were selected from a sample of 31 families living in Orange County, California. The mean age of the children in the sample was 5.3 years (SD = .2; range = 4.7 to 6.0). There were four boys and three girls in the study group. The families had been recruited randomly from hospital births that met the following criteria: mother 18 years of age or older, fluent in English, having no medical complications at the birth, and not planning to move within the next three years; infant not from a multiple birth or needing to stay in the hospital for more than 1 week after birth. The children were among a larger sample tested on the Reynell Developmental Language Scales (Reynell & Gruber, 1990) at 36 months. The mean standard scores for the overall sample for the expressive scale were 98.3 (range 63-127) and for the vocabulary comprehension scale 98.6 (range 62-134). The children in the study group had scores clustering about the mean. For the expressive scale, the range was 77-111, and for the vocabulary comprehension scale, the range was 83-108. The average level of parents' education was 15.2 years (for both mothers and fathers); 56% of the mothers and of the fathers had graduated from college. In particular, the seven mothers had a variety of occupations: one

government field representative; one manager; two professionals; and one company owner. Two mothers were unemployed, two worked full-time and three worked part-time. The fathers, all of whom were employed, also had a variety of occupations: two engineers; one purchasing agent; one file clerk; one manager; one salesman; and one marketing director. All but one of the children were Caucasian (the other one was Asian). As part of a larger assessment of child development, these mothers and children were asked to watch a brief excerpt from a movie together and discuss it.

The Story

The videotaped story was a 5-minute segment selected from the movie *Prancer*, a commercial children's film about a girl who becomes closely attached to one of Santa's reindeer. The segment contained the following events: *Jessica, an 8-9 year-old girl, is seen following an animal's tracks and hears shots as she walks through snowy fields and forest. Jessica's father comes across his daughter unexpectedly while driving his truck on a forest road to go shopping. He criticizes her for being in the forest alone. She explains she was looking for Prancer. They then have a tearful confrontation when her father tells her he is thinking about sending her to live with her Aunt Sarah because he is unable to give her the things she needs now that her mother is no longer there. Jessica yells to her father to stop and the truck screeches to a halt as Prancer suddenly appears on the road in front of them, his leg bleeding. The father goes to get his gun to put the animal out of its misery. Jessica tries to stop him. "No, daddy, no!" They turn around and the animal has mysteriously disappeared.*

This movie segment was selected because it was anticipated that it would arouse in children a complex range of empathic emotions, including fear, anger and sadness when the deer was in danger and relief and happiness when the deer escaped. The segment was also selected because it provided mothers with interesting and complex material to discuss with their children, including the central moral issue of why a hurt animal should be put out of its pain.

Procedure

Each mother-child pair was assessed alone in a child development laboratory playroom at the university. Mothers were told that they would be watching a brief excerpt from the movie *Prancer* with the child and then the child would be expected to retell the

movie story to an experimenter who had not seen it. The mothers were instructed to watch the movie with the child and then talk to the child about the movie as they would at home. The videotape was put into the VCR, and an experimenter told the child to watch the tape carefully because he or she would be telling the story afterwards to someone who hadn't seen the movie. Mothers and children then watched the *Prancer* videotape clip. After viewing the videotape, mothers and children in the mother-discussion condition discussed the story together for as long as they cared to. If the child paused, but seemed ready to talk further, the mother was allowed to paraphrase child's last statement in the form of a simple non-leading question, or ask what happened next. The preparatory conversations between mothers and children and the child's retelling of the movie story were video recorded and transcribed.

Sample Dialogues

The pool of extended dialogues from which the sample was drawn was concerned with three moral themes: Should the little girl be in the forest alone? Should the poor father send his daughter to live with a rich relative? Should the father shoot the hurt deer to put it out of its misery? Seven of the 13 extended dialogues that dealt with these moral themes were concerned with shooting the deer. All seven of these dialogues, labeled as Dialogue # 1, Dialogue # 2, etc., were selected by the author for analysis in the present study. Thus, the sample dialogues were taken from *all* mother-child conversational pairs who talked about *shooting the deer*; and the children in these pairs subsequently told relatively rich stories demonstrating high recall and comprehension. In Appendix 1 find the complete transcripts of the dialogues.

Plan of analysis

The plan of analysis was as follows:

A content analysis was conducted of the mother and child references made about the actions, feelings, and intentions of the three characters in the story: father, daughter, and reindeer. Also coded were mothers' and children's statements concerning the moral rule.

A turn by turn analysis was conducted of the seven transcripts concerning the presence and sequence of IREs; and the presence of collaborative explanations and moral argument turns in the dialogues.

For these analyses the verbatim transcripts of Dialogues #s 1-7 were used.

RESULTS

Did the dialogues employ morality scripts, in which references are made to a set of story elements and moral rule that contributed to children's understanding of the moral? (Q1)

Four subtopics were considered to be essential elements in the comprehension of the characters and the moral rule: Girl's (in the story) feeling; Father's intention; Deer's condition; Moral rule. While the girl's feelings, in which she expressed fear for, and support of the reindeer, were not part of the calculus of an adult model of the pertinent moral in this story, it was expected that this subtopic would need to be covered because of a related moral issue: the rule that one would normally express sympathy and support for the friend (girl) of a helpless animal victim (deer) in a movie story. Because the children who were engaged in the dialogue were likely to identify with the girl in the movie, this further increased the probability that references would be made to the story girl's feelings. Clarification of the father's intentions was expected to be referred to, because in the story the decision as to whether or not to shoot the deer lay in his hands. The moral script needed to refer to the deer's condition to show how this character's feelings and experiences were part of the moral equation, and as a premise for taking further action, i.e., either to put it out of its misery or propose saving it. Finally, it was expected that the moral rule would be referred to, that is, that one needs to put a hurt animal out of its misery, because this would help integrate all the other moral elements.

In Table 1 the moral script subtopics and the specific descriptions that were used by mothers and children in each dialogue are displayed.

- - Table 1: Inclusion of Moral Subtopics by Mothers (M) and Children (C) about here - -

Summary: moral scripts

Five dialogue protocols contained all four subtopics. Only Dialogues # 6 and # 7 did not include the little girl's feelings in their dialogues, but included the three other subtopics. Thus, of 28 possible mentions (4 subtopics X 7 dialogue cases), the results

indicated a total of 26 mentions of the four subtopics. It may be concluded that these subtopics were the standard features comprising the moral script. The statements were unexpectedly rich in references to characters' subjective states given the young age of the children. This may have been enhanced by the emotional power of this movie and the film genre, in general. Dialogues 1, 2 and 3 were dominated by the mothers' statements about the characters and their conclusions about putting a hurt animal out of its misery. However, Dialogues 4 and 5 were led by children's statements about the characters and implications for helping the deer by curing its wounds. Dialogues 6 and 7 were relatively collaborative containing both children's and mother's references. Dialogue 6 contained statements by the only child in the sample who may have understood the moral rule; while in Dialogue 7 the child communicated a fanciful attempt to save the deer through a deer paramedic!

The man's intentions were the most controversial subtopic, with mothers always defending him while the children explicitly or implicitly criticized his actions consistently. The girl's emotions were frequently mentioned early in the dialogue, perhaps because of the likely identification of the child in the conversation with the child character in the movie. The mothers assumed that the moral rule was an important lesson to be learned from the movie segment, and they apparently considered that their children had marginal developmental proficiency in comprehending this moral. The final subtopic mentioned was always the moral rule, and it was stated in conjunction with the deer's suffering or pain. In one case, however, the mother in Dialogue # 2 verbalized the moral rule first, and the conclusion that implied for the deer, then proceeded to answer her child's questions about her conclusion. The data suggested that the mother-child discussion of the moral also provided an anchoring for the child's comprehension of the story. If children understood the moral, then they should be able to better recall and comprehend all the characters' actions, internal states and applicable rule(s) that formed the interrelated components of the moral. This would then serve them to retell the story.

Did the dialogues employ initial standard IRE turn taking sequences? (Q2a)

Of the seven dialogues analyzed, six had IRE sequences at or near the beginning of dialogues. The other (Dialogue # 4) contained an IRE in the middle of the dialogue. Following, (I) refers to inquiry or question, (R) to response, and (E) to evaluation.

DIALOGUE # 1

Turn 1. Mother. Did you like that movie? (I)

Turn 2. Child. Yea. Maybe it was a girl, huh. (R)

Turn 3. Mother. Mmm Hmm. Little sad. He was, she was scared huh? (E)

DIALOGUE # 2

Turn 2. Child. What's suffer? (I)

Turn 3. Mother. Suffer. That is when you are hurt or sick and you have no chance of getting better and you just can't go out and get food to eat or water to drink because the reindeer had a broken leg so he couldn't walk to eat his food or to get water. So then he would die just alone and hungry, thirsty, and that would be suffering. So the Daddy thought he would shoot him so he wouldn't suffer. And then when they looked up he was gone. (R)

Turn 4. Child. Well he wouldn't suffer without it feel better? (E)

DIALOGUE # 3

Turn 1. Mother. What was the daddy going to do with the deer? (I)

Turn 2. Child. Kill him. (R)

Turn 3. Mother. Why? Do you know why? (I)

Turn 4. Child. Mmm Mmm [NO]. (E)

DIALOGUE # 4

Turn 5. Mother. He wanted help? (I)

Turn 6. Child. Yea, the reindeer wanted help. He got hurt. (R)

Turn 7. Mother. He got hurt, and he wanted help. What was the man gonna do? (E)

DIALOGUE# 5

Turn 1. Child. You know he just runned away.

Turn 2. Mother. Why? (I)

Turn 3. Child. He didn't want to be shoot. (R)

Turn 4. Mother. He didn't want to be shot? (I)

Turn 5. Child. No. That wasn't very nice. (E)

DIALOGUE# 6

Turn 2. Mother. "You don't think it would have died? Well have you ever heard that if an animal like a horse or something gets hurt real bad…?" (I)

Turn 3. Child. I know, then…. (R)

Turn 4. Mother. …that means you have to shoot it. (E)

DIALOGUE # 7

Turn 1 Mother. Do you know why he (father) wanted to shoot him (deer)? (I)

Turn 2 Child. Cause he, she, he was already hurt. (R)

Turn 3 Mother. It was already hurt, right. And he was trying to do something good for him, huh? (E)

Dialogic turn taking analysis

There were variations in the dialogues as to which character was the subject of the inquiries. The deer was the subject in four of the dialogues (#s 2, 4, 5, and 6). The father was the character discussed in two dialogues (#s 3 and 7), while in one dialogue (#1) the girl in the story was discussed.

The majority of IRE sequences (5) were Mother-Child-Mother except for those in Dialogues #2 and # 5, which were initiated by the Child. Three IRE contained an embedded question in the evaluation turn. In two of these cases the questions served to trigger new discussion, in some instances one or more IRE (not shown above). While five of the seven dialogues employed standard IRE, in two dialogues the sequences were analyzed as modified IREs (#3 and #5) in which the turn taking assumed the form Inquiry-Response-Inquiry-Evaluation (IRIE). In these IRIEs follow-up questions were needed after the response term to prompt the child's final evaluation. Although three-turn IRE are the most common structures analyzed in dialogues, if we add to these the IRIE forms, it may be more useful to think of their function as forming the *inquiry phase* of the dialogues. Generally, the function of the inquiry phase was to establish *what* the child understood about what characters were doing, feeling and thinking. In Dialogues # 2 and 3, however, the inquiry also established *why* the father intended to shoot the deer.

As predicted by the literature, close readings of the dialogues indicate that the third turn varied somewhat in its principal meanings. The third turns in Dialogues # 1, 2, 3, 5 and 7 were relatively *evaluative*, while in Dialogue # 4 the third turn contained a *paraphrase* and an *embedded question* that served to extend the dialogue. In Dialogue # 6, the third turn *drew out the significance* of the child's response. These findings provide some good empirical examples of Markova and Foppa's (1991) model of dialogue as using three-step units. By conceiving of dialogic events as "A1, B1, and A2 -- where A2 is the integrative reflection on upon the events A1 and B1" (Valsiner, 1996, p. 39) Markova clarifies the use of the third term as an emergent and novel construction. Therefore, no narrow or consistent use of the third term should be expected in dialogues serving the cultural and cognitive constructions of meanings.

Did the dialogues employ collaborative explanations and moral arguments as follow up to the inquiry phase? (Q2b)

The mother-child dialogues were found to contain both mothers' moral arguments and children's competitive moral arguments. Arguments were operationally defined as any statements offering reasoning about solutions, that is, courses of action to be taken to meet the problematic situation of the reindeer.

NB. Following, the mother's and children's arguments have been paraphrased and verbalizations communicating causal logical features, such as "because", "so", and "if-then" constructions were highlighted where explicit and interpreted where implicit.

Maternal Arguments. Five mothers made moral arguments that the deer needed to be shot because it was suffering.

DIALOGUE # 1

(Mother) Because deer don't have doctors, and they can't go to the doctor to get better.

(Mother) The deer was in pain.

(Mother) So he was gonna kill him, so he wasn't in pain anymore.

DIALOGUE # 2

(Mother) When you are hurt or sick and you have no chance of getting better, then you just can't go out and get food to eat or water to drink.

(Mother) Because the reindeer had a broken leg, so he couldn't walk to eat his food or to get water.

(Mother) So then he would die just alone and hungry, thirsty, and that would be suffering.

(Mother) So the Daddy thought he would shoot him, so he wouldn't suffer.

DIALOGUE # 3

(Mother) Because the deer got hurt, and so he was going to kill the deer to put it out of its misery, so it wouldn't suffer anymore.

DIALOGUE # 4 (no moral argument)

(Mother) The reindeer got away, but the girl was crying.

DIALOGUE # 5 (moral question raised but no moral argument)

(Mother). Should the daddy shoot the reindeer?

DIALOGUE # 6

(Mother). If an animal is hurt, then you have to shoot it.

DIALOGUE # 7

(Mother). If animals get hurt real bad, then they can't be helped.

Summary: Maternal arguments

Three of the seven mothers (Dialogues # 1, 2, and 3) employed three term *syllogistic reasoning* in supporting their children's understanding of the moral rule. These mothers made complex arguments consisting of separate statements that the deer was suffering, that there was no chance of it getting better, and, therefore, that it should be put

out of its misery. In two cases (#6 and 7) the arguments were more minimal, assuming the form of if-then reasoning: if animals are hurt, then they can't be helped (or have to be shot). In one case (#5) only a question was used to prompt understanding of the moral issue. Only the mothers in Dialogues # 4 and 5 failed to elaborate the standard adult moral rule. However, the mother in Dialogue # 5 posed the central question that addressed the moral issue: "Should daddy shoot the deer?" Thus, only mother # 4 failed to address the moral issue directly.

Children's arguments. In five of seven cases children's moral arguments were in the service of saving the deer and, therefore, competitive with the mothers' moral arguments. And, in five cases these arguments were made in the final turn or turns of the dialogue. The children's arguments were generally made in response to maternal arguments and can be analyzed in terms of whether they agreed with the mother that the deer should be shot.

DIALOGUE # 1. No. Child statement held out hope for saving deer. "If the deer was hurt..." (Final Turn)
DIALOGUE # 2. No. Child said: "If deer would feel better, then he wouldn't suffer. (Final Turn)
DIALOGUE # 3. -- Child said: "In the end he [Father] killed the deer." [no child argument]
DIALOGUE # 4 No. Child said: "She liked the reindeer, and didn't want dad to shoot him." (Final Turn)
DIALOGUE # 5. No. Child said: "The daddy shouldn't shoot the deer because some reindeers are nice and some reindeers are not." (Final Turn)
DIALOGUE # 6. Yes. Mother said: "The deer would have died because it got hurt?" Child said: "Yeah."
DIALOGUE # 7. No. Child said. "If they have paramedics for dogs and cats , then they have them for deer." (Final Turns)

Summary: Children's arguments

In two dialogues (#s 1 and 2) the children argued weakly that the deer could be helped. In Dialogue # 7 a precocious child suggested that a deer paramedic or veterinarian could help cure the deer. Egocentric reasoning should be noted in Dialogues 4 and 5, with children arguing that the deer should be saved because it was liked or it was nice. The child in Dialogue # 5 disagreed with the father's shooting the deer, not the mother's argument (for no moral was given by the mother). Only one child agreed weakly with the mother's argument (Dialogue # 6) and this child may have understood the moral rule. At this age, children were simply opposed to killing a deer, whatever the maternal arguments.

Summary: Moral argument phase for mothers and children

In five of the dialogues, both mother and child made moral arguments. These consisted entirely of turns involving explanations (some children's arguments were tested subsequently by maternal questions). Children made their own moral arguments, or confirmed a mother's moral argument in six dialogues, excepting Dialogue # 3. The children's arguments contained different kinds of explanations than had been made previously, including both mature if-then logical constructions and developmentally immature references, e.g., to hypothetical or imaginary resources like deer paramedics; or, they made egocentric appeals like favoring not shooting the deer because it was nice or because the child liked the deer. The children's moral arguments were always voiced in the final turn(s) of the dialogue. Moral arguments consisted largely of exchanges of *explanations*; there was little further questioning in this phase of the dialogues.

A scaffolding model for fostering narrative competency: Implications for developing children's intersubjective understanding and moral reasoning

It was apparent that the children lacked narrative understanding of the characters' subjective states, their intersubjective relations, and moral reasoning in the story: they assumed that the father intended to harm the deer, because killing it was not mediated by any understanding of the deer's pain; they did not have deep understanding of what the deer was feeling (suffering/misery), for this state was beyond their experience; they did not know why the girl's feelings for the deer were not taken into account by the father; and, they did not understand, or chose to reject, the moral rule, because, probably, they could not tolerate a hurt animal being hurt further; and rather, they assumed that it was necessary to help the deer. The maternal script in covering all these elements is, therefore, a moral matrix of critical intersubjective understandings about the characters' relations in the movie events. Intersubjective understanding, because the young children and mothers in the conversations were talking about internal states in three different characters and trying to make causal narrative sense of relations between these characters: for example, how the man's intentions would cause further suffering (or death) for the deer; or, how supporting the girl's feelings for the deer would save the deer (and presumably make both the deer and girl happy). The children, possibly, could not

understand, or at least not accept the moral rule as a generalized model of these causal relations from an adult perspective, because they could not understand or accept their mothers' interpretations about the story characters' intersubjective relations.

It is argued that children's mastery of characters' intersubjective relations would be needed for them to accept either the simpler or complex syllogistic logic. However, the movie may have inspired mothers to try and teach this moral logic earlier in child development than might have been expected. In a movie it is easier to arouse empathy for and identification with the characters. The movie form arouses protective feelings for the characters and leads to children expressing emotions toward the characters. Through dialogic inquiry, as well, feelings about the characters were aroused. Thus, while children do not yet understand intentions, they do sense what the characters are feeling and are moved to empathy with them. Feelings, then, apparently provide the intersubjective foundation for moral teaching at this age. All of the characters' states and in the proper order, tied together with logical conjunctions, are required to teach the moral.

Drawing on these findings, it is suggested that mothers, after they saw how children responded to the inquiry phase, opportunistically adopted the goal of teaching their children the moral rule and reasoning behind the rule during the rest of the dialogue. As we have reported previously (Clarke-Stewart & Beck, 1999) the successful mothers in this study were moral cognitive developmentalists. For children at this age, the challenging aspects of narration concerned the characters' internal states, motives and emotions. They also needed adult support to understand and incorporate the underlying moral logic that organized these several character motives, actions, and emotions, i.e., the moral. The mothers recognized that because of their children's marginal developmental comprehension of the applicable moral in this case, the moral rule needed to be taught through narrative contextualization: by spelling out the concrete intentional interactions that provided the storied examples of the moral; and, by arguing how these examples could be used to implicate the moral rule.

To build on this foundation of narrative contextualization, it was necessary for mothers to methodically sequence and organize these intersubjective understandings to support children's acquisition of moral logic. It was found that in five of the dialogues, the narrative contextualization assumed the form of either complex syllogistic reasoning

or simpler if-then reasoning. Teaching the moral involves use of appropriate sequences of the narrative statements or terms of the syllogism, or simple reasoning, and insertion of the relevant conjunctions, i.e., because/so (therefore) and if-then. In other words, mothers wanted children to accept their version of their plot of the actions implicated in the moral. These mothers' syllogistic scripts may be generalized as follows:

- The reindeer was hurt.
- A hurt wild animal cannot be helped.
- The father went to get his gun to shoot the deer so that he wouldn't suffer.

Whereas the immature reasoning in the children's scripts can be generalized:

- The reindeer was hurt
- The reindeer needed help
- The father went to get the gun to shoot the deer to hurt him.
- The little girl was unhappy and judged the father as bad.
- Therefore, the deer should be or could be saved.

Among the seven children, distinct stages of moral reasoning were analyzed. At the earliest stage, two children (#s 4 and 5) used egocentric arguments to save the deer, because it was nice or because the child liked the deer. As if to confirm that these children were less developed, their mothers allowed them to direct the dialogue, and did not try to use moral arguments. Children #s 1, 2 and 3 occupied a middle stage. The mothers of these children used three-term syllogistic moral arguments to scaffold their understanding of the moral. These children responded with weak or partial counter-arguments. It is notable that these children used if- or if-then constructions in their arguments. Children #s 6 and 7 may have had the most developed reasoning. Their mothers used more minimal if-then logic, perhaps assuming that children understood the moral rule. It was tentatively concluded that child # 6 may have understood the moral rule. Child # 7 appeared to understand the maternal argument very well, but was advanced enough to propose a strong counter-argument in which world conditions (deer medicine) existed that might save the deer anyhow.

The story of the moral is told, then, through syllogistic and simple causal if-then logic. It is still uncertain whether two-term, if-then logic (if the deer is hurt, then it must be put out of its misery) developmentally precedes or succeeds the children's

understanding of the three-term syllogistic logic. The more minimal scaffolding logic might be used with developmentally mature children, while the full syllogism might be needed to provide more complete scaffolding. In the latter, the first two statements must be about the deer's suffering and the impossibility of medical help, but the order is immaterial; and the conclusion must refer to the man's intended action and the rule that makes this action good. The moral is the story condensed to a syllogism involving the sequencing of the critical actions and inner states of the characters and their intersubjective relations with each other. The syllogism is taught through inquiry (question-answering) and counter-arguments attempting to rebut the children's misunderstandings as embodied in their scripts.

DISCUSSION

The study contributed to a theory of moral reasoning development and methodological tools through which an understanding of culture and cognition as interdependent processes could be analyzed during children's cultural appropriation of moral reasoning in extended conversations with adults. It is suggested that the moral may be an important, yet overlooked narrative structure in studies of retelling or composing stories. The logically organized story of the moral, in fact, provides a condensed set of cultural cognitions about the relations between the characters as well as placement in a sequential argument intended to serve discussant understanders how they should be judging the characters. By containing all the nuclear information about the characters, the moral also serves as a means for recovering the story plot. Reciprocally, it was concluded that knowledge of characters, particularly their inner states, is a precursor for learning the moral, and hence, for the mother introducing their children to moral reasoning.

As Valsiner (1996) proposed, emergent processes in natural problem solving proved to be a fecund resource in analyzing cognitions that were implicated in cultural appropriation. And, according to his model, the microgenetic sequence of dialogic events was crucial in understanding how inquiry develops. It may also be concluded that functional structures were discovered in which children's views proved to be "novel mechanisms" yet were "coordinated with context demands" as was predicted (albeit in

opposition to the arguments of the mothers as cultural guides). The results suggest that it was the moral rule that integrated the interdependence of culture and cognition in problem solving dialogues about a movie story.

How does this study inform the issue of co-construction and directional leadership in the conduct of inquiry into the moral of the story? The data indicated that the mothers exerted considerable leadership in the learning. They recognized in their children's emotional states and lack of moral developmental reasoning the need to target the story's moral for discussion. During the dialogues mothers utilized graduated forms of support: (a) mothers supported children by modeling or filling in knowledge as a response to children's queries, such as providing information about the moral rule; (b) mothers supported by pointing and prompting children through questions to provide missing information; (c) mothers provided support through evaluative feedback to children's responses, the feedback giving an appraisal of children's moral understandings; and, (d) maternal explanations pointed to elements missing in children's moral understandings.

The children also provided support for the inquiry. By voicing their opinions about the wrongness of the father's actions, by defending the deer, and in one case by inquiring into the deer's suffering, children provided information about their conceptions of the moral that led their mothers to elaborate their own arguments in rebuttal. Nevertheless, following Rogoff (1993) it must be concluded that while the children actively participated in their cultural appropriation, they played a subordinate role in the co-construction.

Mothers appear to understand intuitively that they must address each misunderstood subtopic of the moral, yet weave the whole into the conclusion that the adult theory of the context of the moral applies. But, just as strongly, the children cling tenaciously to their own theories. Perhaps, in displaying counter-theories the children are establishing one pole of the Zone of Proximal Development, while the other adult pole is defined by the mothers through the culturally normative script. But to get from one pole to another, mother and child would have to negotiate (in future dialogues) a matrix of the moral context. The building blocks of this matrix can be traversed through Valsiner's methodological pathways along each subtopic of the theme. It did appear that the father's intentions were most important to debate, yet the deer's condition and needs also

defined an important area of emotional understanding to talk about. Ruling out the possibility of deer medicine also needs to be clarified. Children should also know why the girls' feelings were irrelevant to the moral argument. And, they need to understand why egocentric reasoning misses the point of the relevant issues in the moral, within the confines of their developmental potential.

If mothers expect that their children, after viewing the movie and prior to discussion, already have theories of the prevailing moral context and have morally judged all the characters acting in the context, then what can mothers do? This group of mothers used inquiry early in the dialogue to give them enough information to predict (or confirm if the mother was able just by looking at the movie to be able to project their children's theories) the children's script theories of the moral context, and therefore that the children were likely to support one character over another, and judge one character as the perpetrator and the other as the victim. And having established the children's theories definitively by the end of the IRE, the mothers used the rest of the dialogues to propose counter-theories. But in the children's resistance to the mothers' theories, they elaborated the content of the world only suggested in the IRE inquiry phase. This extended not only to interpretations of the characters' states, but referred to such world conditions as the existence of deer hospitals and paramedics.

Did these children learn anything from the conversations? Did they undergo any development in their moral reasoning? Well, not necessarily in the brief space of the dialogue. But they have now been exposed to their mothers' models of the moral environment. They have engaged in comparing two versions of the same objective movie phenomenon, their own and their mothers'. And because the mothers' versions have been exposed under competitive, emotion arousing conditions, they may be better remembered on future occasions. But also, the children have been given the opportunity to construct arguments involving moral reasoning, and are beginning to exercise the formal logical constructions that underlie moral rules: e.g., because-therefore, if-then, what if, etc. Practice in using these logical constructions may generalize subsequently to other forms of social thinking and even scientific inquiry and argument. Therefore, while it cannot be said that the children actually learned anything, it is persuasive to conclude that mothers and children ought to engage in these kinds of moral appropriation dialogues routinely

about real-life or mediated social dramas. And parents ought to be trained in using IRE dialogic turn taking and scripted inquiry and argument during extended conversations with their children.

Limitations and implications for further study.

Seven dialogues of a small and homogenous middle class sample constitute a limited set of data on which to build a complex model of scaffolding children's cultural understanding of a movie story. To produce additional data for these claims, it would be necessary to test the scaffolding model that has been developed on larger and more diverse populations. In particular, the model needs to be tested on less advantaged populations, whose parents might not be accustomed to holding extended dialogues with their children about movie or literature stories. As components of this scaffolding model have been found in a variety of natural and experimental adult-child educational contexts and across a wide range of problems (classroom instruction, family moral socialization, tutoring, experimental problem-solving), and given the results of this study, it would seem plausible to develop it in a prototype program for organizing the training of scaffolding for parents in a movie retelling task. In the proposed program:

Mothers would be trained to conduct their communications with reference to the important moral(s) of the story. As building blocks for teaching to the moral, the key characters' feelings and reasons for acting, or potential actions, would need to be explored. This should facilitate children's comprehension of the characters' actions. Then, the moral rule could be scaffolded in relation to the children's understanding of the characters. This scaffolding should assume a simple if-then or syllogistic form depending on the maturity level of the child.

Mothers would progressively structure their dialogues sequentially with basic inquiry (IRE) and follow-up with an explanatory moral argument phase. Questions of increasing complexity (what-why-what if) should be used to guide the children's understanding. Mothers should be encouraged to propose and test their ideas about the characters' emotions and reasons for acting. Mothers also need to evaluate their children's responses and extend the discussion through follow-up questions. Mothers would encourage their children to voice their causal explanations of characters' actions, justify their explanations, and propose solutions. After determining that children have fully

voiced their views, adults should question the children's views further and/or contrast the children's views with their own. This complex scaffolding would necessarily take place in more extended dialogues than have been reported in this study

References

Amidon, E. & Flanders, N. A. (1963). Interaction analysis as a feedback system. In A. A. Bellack, J. R Davitz, et al. (1963). The language of the classroom, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Cooperative Research Program, Project No. 1497. New York, Institute of Psychological Research, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Arnold, D. H., Lonigan, C. J., Whitehurst, G. J., & Epstein, J. N. (1994). Accelerating language development through picture-book reading: Replication and extension to a video training format. Journal of Educational Psychology, 86, 235-243.

Beck, R. J., & Clarke-Stewart, K. A. (1998). Improving 5-year-olds' narrative recall and comprehension. Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 19, 543-571.

Beck, R. J. & Wood, D. (1993). The dialogic socialization of aggression in a family's court of reason and inquiry. Discourse Processes, 16, 341-362.

Bellack, A. A., Davitz, J. R., et al. (1963). The language of the classroom, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Cooperative Research Program, Project No. 1497. New York, Institute of Psychological Research, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Blasi, A. (1987). The psychological definitions of morality. In J. Kagan & S. Lamb (Eds.), The emergence of morality in young children. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Bruner, J. (1986). Actual minds, possible worlds. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Cazden, C. B. (1988). Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Clarke-Stewart, A. K. & Beck, R. J. (1999). Maternal scaffolding and children's narrative retelling of a movie story. Early Childhood Research Quarterly.

Dale, P. S., Crain-Thoreson, C., Notari-Syverson, A., & Cole, K. (1996). Parent-child book reading as an intervention technique for young children with language delays. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 16, 213-235.

Dillon, J. T. (Ed.) (1988). Questioning and discussion. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Edwards, C. P. (1987). Culture and the construction of moral values: A comparative ethnography of moral encounters in two cultural settings. In J. Kagan & S. Lamb (Eds.), The emergence of morality in young children. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Emde, R., Johnson, W. F., & Easterbrooks, M. A. (1987). The do's and don'ts of early moral development: Psychoanalytic tradition and current research. In J. Kagan & S. Lamb (Eds.), The emergence of morality in young children. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Fivush, R., & Fromhoff, F. A. (1988). Style and structure about mother-child conversations about the past. Discourse Processes, 11, 337-355.

Flanders, N. A. (1963). Intent, action and feedback: a preparation for teaching, Journal of Teacher Education, 14, 251-260.

Graesser, Arthur C., Bowers, C., Hacker, D. J., & Person, N. (1997). An anatomy of naturalistic tutoring. In K. Hogan & M. Pressley (Eds.), Scaffolding student learning, (pp. 145-184). Cambridge, MA: Brookline.

Haden, C. A., Reese, E., & Fivush, R. (1996). Mothers' extratextual comments during storybook reading: Stylistic differences over time and across texts. Discourse Processes, 21, 135-169.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1993). Towards a language-base theory of learning. Linguistics and Education, 5, 93-116.

Herrenkohl, L. R. & Guerra, M. R. (1998). Participant structure, scientific discourse, and student engagement in fourth grade. Cognition and Instruction.

Hobsbaum, A., Peters, S., & Sylva, K. (1996). Scaffolding in reading recovery. Oxford Review of Education, 22 (1), 17-35.

Kurtines, W. M. , Alvarez, M. & Azmitia, M. (1990). Science and morality: the role of values in science and the scientific study of moral phenomena. Psychological Bulletin. 107, 3, 287-295.

Lemke, J. L. (1993). Intertextuality and educational research. Linguistics and Education, 4(3-4), 257-268.

Lonigan, C. J., & Whitehurst, G. J. (1998). Relative efficacy of parent and teacher involvement in a shared-reading intervention for preschool children from low-income backgrounds. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 13, 263-290.

McCabe, A., & Peterson, C. (1991). Getting the story: A longitudinal study of parental styles in eliciting narratives and developing narrative skill. In A. McCabe & C. Peterson (Eds.), Developing narrative structure (pp. 217-253). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Markova, I., & Foppa, K. (Eds.) (1991). Asymmetries in dialogue. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Press.

Mehan, H. (1979). Learning lessons. Cambridge, MA: Harvard.

Much, N. C. & Shweder, R. A. (1978). Speaking of rules: The analysis of culture in breach. In W. Damon (Ed.), New Directions for Child Development. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Newman, D. Griffin, P., & Cole, M. (1989). The construction zone: working for cognitive change in school. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Peterson, C., & McCabe, A. (1994). A social interactionist account of developing decontextualized narrative. Skill. Developmental Psychology, 30, 937-948.

Reese, E., & Fivush, R. (1993). Parental styles of talking about the past. Developmental Psychology, 29, 596-606.

Reese, E., Haden, C. A., & Fivush, R. (1993). Mother-child conversations about the past: Relationships of style and memory over time. Cognitive Development, 8, 403-430.

Rogoff, B. (1993). Children's guided participation and participatory appropriation in sociocultural activity. In R. Wozniak and K. Fischer (Eds.), Development in context (pp. 121-153). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Schank, R. C. & Abelson, R. P. (1977). Scripts, plans and knowledge. In P. N. Laird-Johnson & P. C. Wason (Eds.), Thinking: Readings in cognitive science. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sinclair, J. M. & Coulthard, R. M. (1975). Toward an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils. London: Oxford University Press.

Stone, C. A. (1998). The metaphor of scaffolding: Its utility for the field of learning disabilities. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 31(4), 344-64.

Valsiner, J. (1996). Cultural organization of cognitive functions. In M.P. Friedman & E. C. Carterette (Eds.), Cognitive Ecology (pp. 29-58). San Diego: Academic Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1962). Thought and language. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Wells, G. (1999). Dialogic inquiry: Towards a sociocultural practice and theory of education. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Whitehurst, G. J., Falco, F. L., Lonigan, C. J., Fischel, J. E. (1988). Accelerating language development through picture book reading. Developmental Psychology, 24, 552-559.

Wood, D., Bruner, J., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 17, 89-100.

Wood, D., & Middleton, D. (1975). A study of assisted problem-solving. British Journal of Psychology, 66, 181-191.

Table 1

Inclusion of Moral Subtopics by Mothers (M) and Children (C)

Dialogue #	Girl's Feeling	Father's Intention	Deer's Condition	Moral Rule
1	The girl was sad/scared (M)	He wanted to kill deer (C)	The deer was hurt (M)	He was going to kill him so he wasn't in pain anymore (M
2	Little girl didn't want him to die (M)	Daddy thought he might shoot him (M)	Reindeer hurt his foot/had broken leg (M)	Daddy thought he might shoot him, so he didn't suffer (M)
3	The little girl didn't want the deer to die (M)	He was going to kill the deer (C)	Deer got hurt (M)	He was going to kill the deer to put it out of its misery. (M)
4	Child was scared (C) Girl crying (M)	Man was going to shoot him (C)	Reindeer wanted help (C)	Cause she liked the reindeer and didn't want the dad to shoot him. (C)
5	Girl sad (C)	Reindeer didn't want to be shot by dad (C)	Reindeer runned away (C)	Daddy shouldn't shoot because some reindeers are nice and some are not. (C) Do you think daddy should shoot the deer? (M)
6	---	He got to kill it (C)	Reindeer was hurt (C) (M)	If an animal gets hurt real bad then you have to shoot it. (M)
7	---	Father wanted to shoot deer (M) Father bad (C)	Reindeer already hurt (M)	If animals get hurt real bad, then they can't be helped (M). Maybe he could have been saved if the paramedics were called.(C)

Appendix 1: Dialogue Transcripts

Dialogue # 1

Turn 1. Mother. Did you like that movie?

Turn 2. Child. Yea. Maybe it was a girl, huh?

Turn 3. Mother. Mmm Hmm. Little sad. He was, she was scared huh?

Turn 4. Child. Yea. Cause they thought that he would shoot him, like he was.

Turn 5. Mother. Cause, do you know why?

Turn 6. Child. Why?

Turn 7. Mother. Cause the deer was hurt.

Turn 8. Child. Why did he want to kill him?

Turn 9. Mother. Because deer don't have doctors, and they can't go to the doctor to get better. And the deer was in pain. And so he was gonna kill him so he wasn't in pain anymore. Okay.
Turn 10. Child.If there was a deer and he was a hurt deer…

Dialogue # 2 (130428)

Turn 1. Mother And they saw a reindeer and he hurt his foot, and the daddy thought he might shoot him so he didn't suffer, and the little girl didn't want him to die.

Turn 2. Child. What's suffer?

Turn 3. Mother. Suffer. That is when you are hurt or sick and you have no chance of getting better and you just can't go out and get food to eat or water to drink because the reindeer had a broken leg so he couldn't walk to eat his food or to get water. So then he would die just alone and hungry, thirsty, and that would be suffering. So the Daddy thought he would shoot him so he wouldn't suffer. And then when they looked up he was gone.

Turn 4. Child. Well he wouldn't suffer without it feel better?

Turn 5. Mother. He might have, will it make you feel better if his owy was better? Yea.

Dialogue # 3

Turn 1. Mother. What was the daddy going to do with the deer?

Turn 2. Child. Kill him.

Turn 3. Mother. Why? Do you know why?

Turn 4. Child. Mmm Mmm.

Turn 5. Mother. Because the deer got hurt, and so he was going to kill the deer to put it out of its misery so it wouldn't suffer anymore. The little girl didn't want the deer to die, did he, did she?

Turn 6. Child. Mmm Mmm.

Turn 7. Mother. So what happened at the end though, do you know what happened at the end?

Turn 8. Child. He killed the deer.

Turn 9. Mother. No, he didn't. The deer disappeared and he went to shoot him and the deer wasn't there anymore it was gone. Did you see that? The deer was gone, when he turned back to shoot him, the deer was all gone.

Dialogue # 4

Turn 1. Mother. Wow.

Turn 2. Child. That was a scary story.

Turn 3. Mother. That was a scary story? What scared you?

Turn 4. Child. When the reindeer was gonna get killed and didn't nothing. He wanted help.

Turn 5. Mother. He wanted help?

Turn 6. Child. Yea, the reindeer wanted help. He got hurt.

Turn 7. Mother. He got hurt, and he wanted help? What was the man gonna do?

Turn 8. Child. Shoot him.

Turn 9. Mother. Yea. But, he got away huh?

Turn 10. Child. Mmm Hmm.

Turn 11. Mother. That's good, why was the girl crying?

Turn 12. Child. Cause [s]he liked the reindeer and didn't want him [Dad] to shoot him.

Dialogue # 5

Turn 1. Child. You know he just runned away?

Turn 2. Mother. Why?

Turn 3. Child. He didn't want to be shoot.

Turn 4. Mother. He didn't want to be shot?

Turn 5. Child. No. That wasn't very nice.

Turn 6. Mother. How do you think that little girl would feel?

Turn 7. Child. If she shoots him? Then sad.

Turn 8. Mother. Oh. Do you think the daddy should do that?

Turn 9. Child. No, because some reindeers are nice and some reindeers are not.

Turn 10. Mother. Did you like the reindeer?

Turn 11. Child. Yea I do. He's kind of a nice reindeer I think.

Dialogue # 6

Turn 1. Child. She was supposed to look at, at the person whoever shot…got it hurt. That was not the dad. And, umm, he got to kill it, because, anyways, it wouldn't have died."

Turn 2. Mother. You don't think it would have died? Well have you ever heard that if an animal like a horse or something get hurt real bad.

Turn 3. Child. "I know, then…

Turn 4. Mother. …that means you have to shoot it.

Turn 5. Child. I know. I said that. Anyways it really would have died.

Turn 6. Mother. It would have died because it got hurt?

Turn 7. Child. Yeah.

Dialogue # 7

Turn 1 Mother. Do you know why he (father) wanted to shoot him [deer]?

Turn 2 Child. Cause he, she, he was already hurt.

Turn 3 Mother. It was already hurt, right. And he was trying to do something good for hm, huh?

Turn 4 Child. Bad.

Turn 5 Mother. Well, sometimes when animals get hurt real bad, they can't be helped.

Turn 6 Child. Well, well, he doesn't think in his mind. Maybe he could, he could have called the paramedic and maybe he could have been saved.

Turn 7 Mother. Do they have paramedics for reindeer?

Turn 8 Child. Well they have paramedics for dogs, and they have paramedics for cats…

Turn 9 Mother. You're right, we have seen…

Turn 10 Child. …they have paramedics for mouses.

Turn 11 Mother. Where could he have taken him instead of shooting him to make him better?

Turn 12 Child. To the hospital.

Turn 13 Mother. To the hospital. What kind of hospital?

Turn 14 Child. A reindeer hospital.

Turn 15 Mother. "A reindeer hospital? Is there such a thing as a…what is the place called we take animals when they are sick?

Turn 16 Child. Animal veterinarian.

Turn 17 Mother. Very good. Veterinarian.

… = pause of 3 seconds or more